IMPORTANT LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Willis and Webb Case in the Superior Court.

Superior Court.

Before Bon. Judge Sandfe oth Coddington and Mary I. his wife, against James Webb.—The complaint of the plaintiffs above-d respectfully shows—That the plaintiff, Mary I., is daughter of Henry Inman, late of the city of sed; that on the 16th day of May, 1844, stermarried with the plaintiff, Smith Coddington that at the time of her said marriage, she was between 1 and 18 years of age, and resided with her parents in wich street, in the city of New York and continued reside with her parents, after her marriage, until sout the month of April, 1845, when, with her said husand, she removed to the village of Rahway, in the State M New Jersey, where they have ever since resided; that there are three children of said marriage now living, all of whom are girls; that before her marriage, and, to the a correspondence by notes or letters had been carried on between the plaintiff, Mary I., and Nathaniel P. Wilhe were the planning hary I., and Nathanie P. Wil-his, of the city of New York, without the knowledge of her parents; that about the latter part of that year, or in the beginning of the year 1844, the fact that such cor-respondence had been carried on became known to her father, who advised that it should be, and it was imme-

That the notes, or letters, which had been written to said Mathaniei P. Willis by the plaintiff, Mary I., remained in the possession of said Willis, at the time of the terminathe possession of said wills, at the time of the termina-tion of the said correspondence, and the father of the said plaintiff, Mary I, deeming it most appropriate that the said correspondence of his daughter with the said Wills should be surrendered; but not believing or assert. ing that she had ever been guilty of criminal intercours or that the said letters contained any evidence of an such conduct on her part, in the month of June, 1846, requested the defendant, James Watson Webb, and garded as his personal friends, to obtain the said letters from the said Nathaniel P Willis and when obtained, to ver them to him. That the said James Watson Webb and George Buck! am undertook such service.

That as the plaintiffs are informed and believe, in pur

seance of such request, and with no other authority whatever, the said George Buckham addressed a note to the said Nathaniel P. Willis, requesting him to meet the said James Watson Webb and George Buckham, at the office of said Buckham, in the city of New York; that the said Nathaniel P. Willis was not apprised of the purpose for which he was requested to meet said James Watson Webb and George Buckham, and at the time appointed in said note went to said Buckham's office, where he met Willis was then informed by said James Watson Webb and George Buckham that the father of the plaintiff. Mary I., had become aware that previous to her marriage, she had been corresponding with said Willis, and that it was his wish that the said Willis should deliver to them, to be handed to bim, all letters and corodence in the hands of said Willis, which he had ever at any time received from her.

That said Nathaniel P. Willis stated that he had in hi persection the notes or letters which had been received by him from the plaintiff, Mary I., and that he was perfeetly willing to deliver them up, as requested; but not having been informed of the object for which his presence had been desired, he had not looked them up; an sintment was then made between the said parties, for the said Willis to meet the said Webb and Buckham, at the office of the latter, on the following day, to deliver ever the letters in his possession, which he had received from the plaintiff, Mary I., to the said Webb and Buckham, to be by them delivered to her father.

That, (as the plaintiffs are informed and believe.) on the day following the last mentioned interview, the said Nathaniel P. Willis again attended at the hour appointed, at the office of said George Buckbam, and ther met the said James Watson Webb and George Buckham. That the said Willis brought with bim a package in paper cover or exvelope, which, as the plaintiffs are in-fermed and believe, contained all the notes or letters in his possession, which he had received for m the plaintiff. Mary I., and the said Willis th n asked the said Webb and Buckham to which of them he should deliver said package, for her father; that the said Webb replied that he would take the package, stating that he had the directions of the said plaintiff Mary I, to receive them in her behalf. This being assented to by said Buckham, the said Willis scaled up the said package, and de livered the same, so scaled, to said James Watson Webb, to be by him immediately delivered to the father of the plaintiff, Mary I. and with no other intent and for no other purpose. That the said James Watson Webb thereupon, for the purpose and on the trust that he would make an immediate dello other purpose, received the said package of letter and correspondence; but notwithstanding the trust upon which he received them, he has ever since retained and now has them in his possession

That for several years before, and up to the period of his decease, the father of the plaintiff Mary I, had been afflicted with chronic asthma and colargement o the heart whereby his constitution had become greatly impaired. That besides, within a few months after the delivery of said letters by said Nathaniel P. Willisaid James Watson Webb, the father of the said plan tiff, Mary I., was seized with an new'e disease of the kin neys, which, acting upon his impaired physical constitution cansed his death on the seventeenth day of Janu-

That between the time of the delivery of said package of notes and letters by the said Willis to the Webb and the time of the decra-e of the said Henry Inman, be was desirous that the same abould be de-tivered to him; and with that riow requested and authorised his friend, the said George Buckham, to call on said Webb, and to request from him the delivery of the said package. That said Bucknam accordingly called on said Webb and requested him to deliver up said package to the said Henry Inman That said Webb in reply stated to said Suckham that said I tiess were among his papers, and that he would look them up and deliver them over as requested; but noth-tanding said promise, said Webb did not deliver the same t the said Henry Inman or to the said Buckham in his behalf, but retained them in his possession.

That some time after the decease of her said father the mother of the plaintiff, Mary I being desirons that said package of notes and letters should be deliwered to her by said Webb requested and subbarized the said Buckham again to call on said Webb and obtain the delivery thereof. That said Sucabam did as cordingly call on said Webb and again requested such delivery, and said Webb then made a semilar statement Buckham as to the letters being not at hand, and again promised to look them up and deliver them over as But, notwithstanding this second promise. the said Webb has never delivered said package of letters but still retains them.

That the said James Watson Webb is editor and proprietor of a newspaper called The Morning Courier and New Fork Enquirer, and the said Nathaniel P. Willia ! likewise an editor and proprietor of a newspaper called the Home Journal, which said newspap re are printed and published in the city of New York, and extensively circuisted throughout the United States and elsewhere That from articles published in their respective as repapers, it would appear that unfriendly relations have for some time e xisted between said Webb and said Willis; but the plaintiffs are not, nor is eather of them in any way or manner connected therewith or enquarble therefor, nor have they or either of them ever at any time or in any manner intermedited the rewith.

And the plaintiffs further state that the plaintiff, Mary I has never spoken or ever spouded with the said Natha-

niei P. Willis since her mid marriage.

That the plaintiff, Mary 1, her known the said James Watson Webb, as a friend of her father, and as a visiter at her father's house, from the period of her earliest recollection, but never formed any particular acquaint ance with him until the year 1844, when traveiling in England, in company with her father, she met him upor several occessions; and upon one occasion, in that year while travelling in Scotland, the said Webb and the plaintiff. Mary L. with her father, passed a fortnight at Murthly Castle, as guests of Sir William Det moneral Stewart; by wince her return to the United States, in March, 1845, she

has never renewed an acquaintance with said Webb. That on the 15th day of May, 1851 the said Jam Watson Webb wrote and published to his said newspaper, called the Morning Courser and New York Enquithat date, an article entitled " The London Times, the Dog Book, and the Home Journal," a copy of which article is hereto namezed, marked schedule A, and to which the plaintiffs pany leave to refer, as part of this their com-

And the pinintiffs charge, that upon the appearance

and very soon a topic of common public conversation that the plaintiff, Mary I., is the person in said article intended and referred to as the person who had been seduced by said Nathaniei P. Willis, and whose ruin had broken her father's heart, and brought him to an un-

That within two days after the publication, in the city of New York, of said article, several of the friends of the plaintiffs came to them at their home, in the village Rahway, and spoke of said publication as referring the plaintiff Mary I., and expressed their sympathy that she should have been thus assailed; and within the week ensuing the said publication, the plaintiffs became aware, to their extreme grief, that not only in the village where they reside, but in the city of New York, and elsewhere it was publicly and notoriously reported and assumed that the plaintiff, Mary I., was the person referred to in said article as the victim of seduction.

And the plaintiff, Mary I., of her own knowledge, the plaintiff, Smith Coddington, of his perfect confidence and belief, solemnly assert and declare that it is abso-jutely and unqualifiedly untrue that the plaintiff, Mary I., was ever seduced by said Nathaniel P. Willis, or that the ever had any improper association or connection whatever with the said Willis. And the plaintiffs further most positively and unequivocally assert that there is no foundation in truth for any charge of want of virtue and

chartity made against the plaintiff. Mary I.

And the plaintiffs further, in like manner, sesert that it is absolutely and unqualifiedly untrue that the father of the said plaintiff, Mary I., became heart-broken, or that his death was in any manner caused or expedited by reason of any correspondence or association which had taken place between the said Nathaniel P. Willis and the said plaintiff, Mary I. On the contrary, the plaintiffs assert that to the latest hour of his life her aid father justly entertained the most undoubted confidence in her integrity and virtue, and that he never any time made any allegation against the plaintiff Mary I., in respect of her said correspondence with said Willis, except that of the admitted indiscretion of having been a party to such correspondence, without the know ledge of her parents, while an immate of her father

house and under age.

And the plaintiffs further state, that the plaintiff Mary I.. at the period of writing said letters, was of the age of about sixteen years, had recently quitted board-ing school, and was wholly inexperienced in the usages of society. That the said Nathaniel P. Willis was literary and professional writer of considerable celebrity and was the author of many works of poetry and fiction

which had been the subject of great admiration in the circle in which the plaintiff, Mary I., lived and visited. That the said Nathaniel P. Willis was regarded by the plaintiff Mary I. as occupying an eminent position in the world of taste and letters; and from the fact that he was an acquaintance of her father, and a visiter at his house, and that the plaintiff, Mary I, had never heard his standing as a man of virtue and character brought in question; and from the further fact that the plaintiff, Mary I., was on terms of intimacy and friendship with the wife of the said Willis, (who was cognizant of her correspondence with him) she did not even imagine that correspondence with him of the kind which subsequently ensued could, in any manner, be made the foun

dation for censure or reproach.

That having been mentioned in some newspaperarticle of said Nathaniel P. Willis as the author of a work of fiction then just published, she wrote a note to said Willis to disavow the authorship of such work. That the said Willis replied to said note, and a correspondence which thus commenced continued for the period of about two months, when the fact of its existence became known to her parents; that although she has no particular recollection of the contents of her letters to said Willis, she believes that they may contain some statements or passages entirely imaginative; but which, by false application or perversion of their meaning-might be construed to her prejudice; and upon which the said James Watson Webb has, in the article from his newspaper, hereinbefore alleged, based a charge of im-purity against her which she most solemnly avers to be otally without foundation in truth.

And the plaintiffs further state, that the said James Vatson Webb has not, nor ever had, any right or titl to the said notes, or letters, or any of them, or any right, permission, or authority, to open the scaled package which contained them | nor has he ever had any right or permission to inspect, read or exhibit, or make known the contents of said notes, or letters, or any of them, or any part thereof, or any right or title to the custody agent of the father of the plaintiff, Mary I., upon the special trust and confidence reposed in him by her said father that he would obtain the same from the said Willis, and immediately band the same over to her said

Nevertheless the said James Watson Webb, without any right, title, permission or authority whatever, and in violation of the trust and confidence reposed in him by the father of the plaintiff. Mary I., and without the knowledge or consent of the surviving parent of the said Mary I, and without the knowledge or consent of the formed and believe, opened the package containing the said notes and letters, has read the raid notes and letters, and has exhibited the same, or some of them, or has read the same, or some of them, or some parts or part thereof to one, or two, or three, or more persons, n the city of New York, or elsewhere.

And the plaintiffs further state, that in further lation of his daty and of the trust and confidence so reored in and accepted by him, as aforesaid, the said ames Watson Webb, on the nineteenth day of May, one housand eight hundred and fifty one, by a statement published by him in his said nowspaper of that date, proposed to place the aforesaid letters before George erris, of the city of New York, and to prove their identity, and to place one of said letters in the hands of said Morris for his perusal (such offer being avowedly made, as appears from the article in said newspaper containing said offer), for the purpose of procuring from said Mon ris. In the apsence of the plaintiffs, and for the purpose of newspaper publication, a report cetablishing the truth of the charge made against the plaintiff, Mary I, and which charge she again most solemnly avers to be ab-

That appeared hereto and marked schedule R. is a cope f the article published by said James Watson Webb in his said newspaper of May the nineteenth, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-one, and which the plaintiffs my leave to make a part of this their complaint.

And the plaintiffs claim and insist that the said notes and letters belong to them, or to the said plaintiff, Mary I.; that the same are their property, and that they are by law entitled to the possession and custody thereof.

And they further state, that on the twenty first day May, one thousand eight hundred and fifty one, they taux I the said notes and letters to be demanded from said James Watson Webb; but that he did not deliver them, but in reply to such demand, stated that he would ook them up and deliver them to the plaintiffs, or one of them, at the proper time. That the said last mentioned demand was made at the office of said Webb. in Wal street, in the city of New York; and they charge, on information and belief, that the said Webb, at the time of such densard had the notes and letters at his said of

ee, in his custody and control. And they further state, that from the aforesald proedings of said James Watson Wobb, the plaintiffs are apprehensive, and so charge that he has made or caused. permitted or suffered to be made some copy or copies of e whole of said letters, or of some or one of them, or some extract or extracts from the same, or from some or on them, and that unless restrained by the order and inlengtion of this honorable Court, he will make some fur ther or other unjustifiable and unwarrantable use of said notes and letters, or of any copies of or extracts there from, which he may have made, or permitted to be made and that he ought, therefore, to be restrained and en-

loined as bereinafter mentioned. And the said plaintiffs claim, that during the pendency of this action, the said letters ought to be placed in the hands of some person of approved honor and integrity

The plaintiffs, therefore, demand judgment :-

That the said James Watson Webb may be adjudged and decreed to deliver over to the plaintiffs, upon oath all notes letters, writings, correspondence and paper which were delivered to him by the said Nathaniel P Willis, as hereinbefore mentioned and all copies thereof, or of any of them, and all extracts therefrom, or fro any of them, which may have been made by the said James Watson Webb, or by any other person or person since the time when the said notes, letters, writings, cor respondence and papers were so delivered by said Nathaniel P. Willis to said James Watson Webb.

And that the said James Watson Webb may be netually restrained and enjoined from making, or per mitting to be made, any copy or extract of or from said notes, letters, correspondence and papers, or any or either of them, and from publishing exposing, inspect. ing, reading, using, interfering with, or controlling and from permitting or suffering any other nerson persons to publish, expose, inspect, read, use, contro nterfers with the said notes, letters, correspondence and

papers, or any of them, or any copies or extracts of, o

rom them, or any of them.

And that the plaintiffs may have such further, or such other relief in the premises as to this Court shall seem meet and proper. HORACH F. CLARK. Attorney for plaintiffs.

City and County of New York, 12:- Smith Coddington and Mary I his wife, the plaintiffs abovenamed, being severally duly sworn, say that the foregoing complaint is true of their own knowledge, except as to the matters which are therein stated on information or beilef, and a to those matters, that they believe it to be true.

MARY I. CODDINGTON. Sworn before me this 28th day of May, 1851.

WM. H. SPARES, Commissioner of Deeds Smith Coddington and Mary I his wife, against Jame Watson Webb.—Summons for Relief.—To the defendant:— You are hereby summoned and required to answer the complaint in this action, of which a copy is herewith

served upon you; and to serve a copy of your answer to the said complaint on the subscriber, at his office, No Wall street, in the city of New York, within twent days after the service hereof, exclusive of the day of suc service; and if you fail to answer the said complaint within the time afcresaid, the plaintiffs in this action will apply to the court for the relief demanded in the complaint. Dated June 2, 1851.

HORACE F. CLARK, Plaintiff's Attorney

Smith Coddington and Mary L. his wife, vs. James Walson Weld -- On reading the complaint in this action, duly verified, and the affidavits of George Buckham, Jane Inman, and Holbert Smales, made on behalf of the plain-tiffs, I order that the defendant, James Watson Webb show cause before this court, at a special term thereo to be held at the City Hall, in the city of New York, o the 6th day of June instant at 10 o'clock in the foreneon, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why he should not be ordered forthwith, upon oath, and under the direction of one of the Justices of this Court, to deliver over to Andrew Warner, Esquire, of the city of New York, or to such other person, of approved honor and integrity, as shall be appointed by this court all the notes, letters, correspondence, and papers men-tioned in the complaint in this action, and which were de-livered to the said defendant by Nathaniel P. Willistin the presence of George Buckham, in or about the month of June, 1845, and all copies thereof, and extracts therefrom made since the delivery of said notes, letters, correspondence, and papers, by the said Nathaniel P. Willis to the said James Watson Webb, to be held by the said Andrew Warner, or such other person as shall be so ap-pointed as receiver, with such directions as to this court shall seem proper; or why such further or other order should not be made in the premises as to this court shall seem just.

LEWIS II. SANDFORD. shall seem just. LE Dated New York, June 2, 1851.

Smith Coddington and Mary I., his wife, vs. Jan Wetson Web.—On reading the complaint in this action, and the affidavits of George Buckham, Jane Imman, and Holbert Smales, and an undertaking daily approved by the plaintiffs, I do order and direct that the defendant, James Watson Webb, do absolutely desist and refrain from making, or permitting to be made, any copy or extract of, or from, the notes, letters, correspondence, and any other papers mentioned in the complaint in this action, and which were delivered to him by Nathaniel P. Willis, in the presence of George Buckham, in or about the month of June, one thousand eight hundred and forty-five; and from parting with disposing of, publishing, exposing, inspecting, or using, and (except so far as shall be necessary for their asie keeping.) from interfering with, or controlling, the said notes, letters, correspondence and papers, or any of the plaintiffs. I do order and direct that the defendant notes, letters, correspondence and papers, or any of them; and also from permitting or suffering any other person or persons to publish, expose, inspect, use, con-trol, or interfere with the said letters, correspondence and papers, or any of them.

LEWIS H. SANDFORD. and papers, or any of them, or any copies or extracts of

Dated New York, June 2, 1851.

Dated New York, June 2, 1851.

APPIDAVIT OF GEORGE RUCKHAM, ESQ.

Smith Cotdington and Mary I., his wife, against James Watson Webb.—City and County of New York, ss.—George Buckham, of said city, being duly sworn, doth depose and say, that in or about the year one thousand eight hundred and forty-five, the defendant, James Watson Webb, and deponent, were requested by Henry Inman, as his considering triends, to apply to Nathaniel P. Willis for, and obtain from him, to be delivered to said Henry Inman, certain notes or letters which the plaintiff, Mary I., the daughter of said Henry Inman, had written to said Nathaniel P. Willis some time before her marriage, and which the said Henry Inman was desirous should be delivered up to him. That in pursuance of such request, a note was written (and, as deponent believes, by deponent,) to said Willis, requesting him to meet the said James Watson Webb and deponent at deponent's office, but without the object of such meeting being therein stated, or in any way referred to. That a meeting of said James Watson Webb, Nathaniel P. Willis, and deponent, accordingly took place at the time and place appointed, when the said Nathaniel P. Willis was informed that the said Henry luman, being aware that a written correspondence had sometime previously been carried on between thaniel P. Willis was informed that the said Henry loman, being aware that a written correspondence had sometime previously been carried on between his daughter, the plaintiff, Mary I., and the said Nathaniel P. Willis, was desirous that all notes or letters which had been received by said Nathaniel P. Willis from the plaintiff, Mary I., should be given up to him, the said Henry Immae; and that the said Henry Imman had authorized them, the said James Watson Webb and deponent, as his friends, to obtain them from said Willis for that purpose. That the said Nathaniel P. Willis then freely stated that he believed he had some notes or letters in his possession, and that he was perfectly willing to give them up as requested. And it was then mutually agreed between the said James Watson Webb, Nathaniel P. Willis, and deponent, that they should again meet on the following day at the same place, said Willis undertaking to look up said notes or letters in the meantime, and to bring them notes or letters in the meantime, and to bring them

with him, and deliver them over.

That, accordingly, on the next day, the said James Watson Webb, Nathaniel P. Willis, and deponent, again met at deponent's office, pursuant to the arrangement, and the said Willis then pro-duced a package in a paper cover, which, he in-formed the said Webb and deponent, contained all the notes or letters in his possession which he had received from the said plaintiff, Mary I., and inquired to which of the parties present (meaning said James Watson Webb and deponent) he should deliver said package. That said Webb replied, deliver said package. That said Webb replied, "You may give them to me;" and deponent believing it to be whelly immaterial to which of them neving it to be wholly immaterial to which of them said peckage should be delivered, ascented thereto. That the said Willis thereupon scaled up the said package, and handed it to the said Webb, to be by him delivered to the said lienry Imma. That the said Webb received the said package, and took it away with him, and deponent has never seen to

since. And deponent says, that the proceedings at both of said meetings were throughout of a courteous nature—that nothing like a threat or menace was held out to said Willis, nor was any charge or sharement made of his having seduced the plaintiff, Mary I., or that the said Fienry Inman had any idea or suspicion thereof, or that any improper intercourse had taken place between said Willis and the plaintiff, Mary I.

And deponent says, that for several years prior

improper in the plaintiff, Mary I.

And dependent says, that for several years prior to said interview, and from that sime down to the day of the death of the said Henry Inman, on the day of January, one thousand the day of the death of the said Heury Imman, on the seventeenth day of January, one thousand eight hundred and forty-six, this deponent was on terms of the closest friendship and intimacy with him, and, as deponent firmly bolieves, had his unreserved confidence that, during the period referred to, deponent was consulted by him, as well on his business affairs, as on matters relating to his private and family concerns, and during the whole of such period, except at such times as the said Henry Imman was temporarily absent from his residence in the city of New York, deponent was in the frequent habit of private and confidential conversation with him, and that such intercourse continued down to and during the last illness of the said Henry Imman. And deponentsays, that both before and after said. And deponents age, that both before and after said the views, he had many conversations with the said leavy lemma, in which his family affairs were most reely discussed; but that the said Henry Imman never, upon any occasion, other directly or indirectly, stated, or gave deponent cause even to imagine, that he had any knowledge, or thought, or suspicion that his said daughter was otherwise than pun and virtuous, or that the said notes or letters written

cion that his said daughter was otherwise than pire by her contained any evidence or anything tending to evince her seduction or want of chastity.

And depotent forther says, that from his close and confidential intimacy with the said Henry luman, deponent feels firmly assured that if the said Henry Inman had known, or thought, or suspected that his said daughter had been reduced, the said Henry Inman would most certainly have disclosed such knowledge, thought, or suspecion, to deponent. And deponent believes that if the health or spirits of the said Hienry Inman had at any time been seriously affected by any such knowledge, thought, or suspicion, deponent could not have tailed to become acquainted therewith. And this deponent verily believes that, to the time of his death, the said Henry Inman had the fullest confidence in the virtue and integrity of his raid daughter, and had rever known or entertained any thought or surticion of her having been seduced by, or having had integrity of the reson.

And dependit says, that the said Nathaniel F. Willis or any other person.

And dependit says, that the said liency Inman never, directly of indirectly, expressed or

And dependent says, that the said Henry In-man never, directly or indirectly, expressed or

intimated to deponent any thought or suspicion that the correspondence between his said daughter and the said Nathaniel P. Willis rentained any disclosure, admission, or evidence of her sedaction, or of any unchaste intercourse between her and the said Willis for having engaged in said correspondence, and also censured his daughter for having been a perty thereto; but, so far as regarded his said daughter, he never, to deponent's knowledge or belief, regarded it otherwise than as an act of indiscretion. And deponent says, that he never heard it alleged that the said plaintiff, Mary I., had been seduced by said Nathaniel P. Willis, until after the publication of the article in the New York Courier and En purer, of the fifteenth day of May, instant, entitled "The London Times, the Day Book, and the Hime Journal," to which article the attention of this deponent was called early on the morning of the day of publication thereof, and throughout the day, and for several succeeding days, as referring to the said Mary I.

And deponent says, that some time after the surrender of said notes or letters by said Willis, the said Henry Inman was decirous that the same should be handed to him and be in his possession, and for that purpose requested deponent to call on the said James Watson Webb and obtain the said package and hand the same to him; and that deponent did accordingly, at the request of said Henry Inman, call en the said James Watson Webb, and inform him of the desire of said Henry Inman, and request him to deliver said notes or letters to deponent, to be by him handed to said Henry Inman, and requested him to deliver said notes or letters of deponent and the said Henry Inman.

And this deponent says, that after the death of the said Webb, and inform him of the desire of said Henry Inman, and requested him to deliver the said Honry Inman, but, as deponent believes, he never did deliver or send them to the said Henry Inman, and requested him to deliver the said Inmes Watson Webb, and informed him that the said Jame

Sworn this 31st day of May, 1851, before me, GEO. P. NELSON, Com. of Deeds.

AFFIDAVIT OF MRS. HENRY INMAN.

Smith Coddington and Mary I. Ins wife against James Watson Webb.—City and County of New York, ss.—Jane Inman, of Hempstead, Queens county, in the State of New York, being duly sworn, says, that she is the widow of Henry Inman, late of the city of New York, deceased; and that the plaintiff, Mary I., is the daughter of deponent and of said Henry Inman; and this deponent says, that the discovery by her and the said Henry Inman that her daughter, the said plaintiff, Mary I., had, unknown to them, been engaged in a correspondence with Nathaniel P. Willis, did not, nor did any other facts or circumstances, excite in their minds any belief or suspicion that the plaintiff, Mary I., had been seduced by said Willis, or that any criminal intercourse had ever taken place or been contemplated by the said plaintiff, Mary I., and the said Nathaniel P. Willis. That the said Henry Inman and deponent considered such correspondence an act of thoughtlessness and indiscretion which, although highly censurable, was attributable to the extreme youth and inexperience of the plaintiff, Mary I.

And deponent says, that from the time of such discovery down to the death of the said Henry Inman, she had the most free, full, and unreserved conversation with him regarding such correspondence, and the conduct and character of their daughter, the plaintiff, Mary I., and was fully acquainted with his views and opinions respecting the same; and she is thereby enabled to state, positively and without reserve, that the said Henry Inman never, at any time, entertained any doubt or suspicion of the purity of their said daughter, Mary I.

And this deponent further says, that the allegation of the death of the said Henry Inman having been caused or hastened by a knowledge or belief of the seduction of the plaintiff, Mary I, had been seduced or was otherwise than chaste and virtuous. And deponent says, that neither she nor the said Henry Itman w

contained any admission or evidence of the seduction of the plaintiff, Mary I., or could in any way impair or affect her reputation for chastity or virtue; but that both the said Heery Immas and deponent were desirous of obtaining possession of said notes and letters, from a feeling of the impropriety of permitting notes or letters, written by a young and inexperienced girl, without the knowledge of her parents, to remain in the hands of the said Nathaniel P. Willis, or of any person.

That it was for that reason, and not with any belief, or fear, or suspicion, that the said notes or letters did or might contain any proof or admission affecting the virtue or chastity of the plaintiff, Mary I, that the said Henry Imman, in his lifetime, and deponent, after his decease, requested George Buck-ham, who had, for several years, been a very intimate and confidential friend of said Henry Imman and deponent, to call on the defendant, James Watson Webb, and obtain and deliver to them, respectively, the notes or letters of the said plaintiff, Mary I., which had been handed by the said Nathaniel P. Willis to the said James Watson Webb, to be delivered up to the said Henry Imman.

And further this deponent saith not.

Swern this 30th day of May, 1851, before us, Gioo. P. Nat.Son, Commissioner of Deeds.

Sworn this 30th day of May, 1851, before me, Geo. P. Nelson, Commissioner of Deeds. APPIDAVIT OF HOLBERT SMALES, E-q.

Smith Cordington and Mary I., his wife, against James Watson Webb—City and County of New York, st.—Holbert Smales, of said city, being duly sworn, says, that at the request and by direction of the plaintiffs in this action, deponent, on the twenty-first day of May, one thousand eight hundred and tity. one, called on the defendant, James Watson Webb, at his office, in Wall storet, in the city of New York, and in the names and on behalf of the plaintiffs demanded the notes or latters mentioned in the complaint in this action; but the said James Watson Webb did not deliver the ebb did not deliver the same, or any of them, to

Webb did not deliver the same, or any of shem, to deponent then or at any time.

And deponent says, that, in answer to such demand, the said James Watson Webb stated he would deliver said notes or letters to the plaintiff, Smith Coddington, or to the plaintiff, Mary I. Coddington, at the proper time.

H. Scales, Sworn before me this 30th day of May, 1851.

Wat. H. Scales, Commiss of Deeds.

THE LONDON TIMES, THE DAY BOOK, AND THE HOME JOURNAL.—The personal abuse when may be heaped upon the editor of this or any other American journal, by the Cimes newspaper in London, is ican journal, by the Cimis newspaper in London, is of very little importance to the chitor skudered, and of still less consequence to his readers. But when such abuse is intended to demonstrate to all Europe that the press of the United States, generally, is in the hands of reckless and unprincipled men, and its leading press conducted by "a coward, a educer, a swindler, and a sentenced felon, who escaped the lash," and the charge sustained by extended extracts from the New York Dig Book, and Willis's Home Journal, it becomes a duty to refer to the subject, not by way of defence at home, but to sustain those who, from a mere feeling of magnanimity and self-respect, have deemed it right to defend the absent, and rebuke the slanderer.

The London Times is the great advocate of "free trade" just now, and will continue to be just so long as that continues the popular side of the question; but it is notorious to the reading world of both Europe and America, that since the passage of the Reform bill, more than twenty years ago, the Times is the veriest weathercock in existence. It changes the Cimes newspaper in London, is

Reform bill, more than twenty years ago, the Times is the veriest weathercock in existence. It changes with public opinion from day to day, and year to year; and unblushingly avows its venishity in this regard. In one respect only has it ever exhibited any consistency; and that is, in its hatred of everything American, and its unceasing labors to defame and slander our people and our institutions, and to injure them in the estimation of Europe. of everything American, and its unceasing labors to defame and slander our people and our institations, and to injure them in the estimation of Europe. This shameful propensity, indulged in with the most reckless disregard of truth and common decency, we have from time to time exposed, as our readers well know; and in consequence, and because we have pointed out the injury which England is suffering from free trade, the Times has never failed to embrace every opportunity which presented, of republishing the scurrility and abuse which has been so frequently heaped upon us by the filthy sheets whose names digrace our columns in this article. Its recent attack was one more personal and abusive than those which preceded it; and soutterly reckless and scurrilous, that some Americans in London, and the London press, cried out shame, and rebuked it in a manner which compelled the editor on the 25th ult., to offer the only apology which he could invent, viz —that its purpose was not so much to ascall the editor of this paper, as to exhib the character of the American press and its con-

much to assail the editor of this paper, as to exhib the character of the American press and its conductors.

To the London Morning Post and its correspondent, we feel especially indebted for its defence of us individually; and still more so, for its defence of the American press generally, and its expose of the character of the Doy Book and its collaborers in infamy. Alluding to the personal assault based upon the Day Book and Home Journal, the Morning Post says:—

"Our renders will be surprised, on perusing the article in question, that any newspaper in the world should have been so lost to all sense of propriety as to originate such a thing; and we may asfely leave them to make the comments which their own feelings will dictate—but which we forbear even to suggest—as to the conduct of our cotemporary in republishing an article so infamous, and giving to a shameless personal libel the currency of its extended circulation, and the prestige of its name, without check or qualification.

"This would be bad enough, had the journal and the editor who were defamed been utterly unknown to our contemporary, and the article been cited (as it professed to be,) merely to show what one transatlantic editor could say of another; but when it transpires that the journal attacked has been for years the declared, but open and manly antagonist of the Times, the re-publication looks something less like the effort of a mere amateur in literary curiosities; and the climax is reached when it is declared that the "editor" of this journal, who is, in this article, held up to the detectation of manly nitry, and familiarly known to many persons in the foremost ranks of English society; and, finally, known to the world at large as the intimate friend of the late President Taylor, (who, in fact, owed his election to the Executive chair in no small degree to General Webb's efforts and influence)—and by him appointed Minister of the United States to the court of Vienna; an appointment which is in itself so far a guarantee of a man's charac

"But, in fact, the articles which the Times has "But, in fact, the articles which the I lime has published have been extracted from journals not only devoid of all character, but well known to our contemporary as being so; and worse still, as not American in any respect, but the locality of publication—being, in truth, ewned and conducted by Europeans, many of whom have little in common with the interests or respectability of the country of their adoption."

"It is unquestionably true, that the English esti-mate of the character and ability of American news-papers has been influenced and modified by, if not actually formed upon, the extracts made from them by the English journals; and it is equally true, that no paper makes those 'extracts' as freely as the Times."

"Conduct like this is so disingenuous, and so utterly opposed to every English instinct of fair play, that even the consummate assurance of our contemporary cannot carry it off, if once fairly placed before the public, and clearly exposed.

"Had the New York Contro or Journal of Commerce habitually laid before its readers extracts from the Age or the Satirist, and solemnly avouched them as examples of English newspaper literature, and expressions of English sentiments, declaring those journals themselves to be 'the leading organs of public opinion' in Great Britain, it would be but the precise counterpart of what the Times has done, wilfully and determinately, for the last fifteen years, in the face of all that could be urged against such gross and wanton misrepresentation."

"Public opinion, in the United States, is influenced by, and imparts its tone to, such journals as the Courier and Enquirer, the Advertiser, and the Journal of Commerce, of New York; the Intelligencer, of Washington; the Gazette, of Philadelphia; and the Journal, of Boston, with many others of proximate status, whom we forbear to name; and by every arrival from America, copies of meany of these papers reach every member of the metropolitan press. Yet the Times prefers to ignore the very existence of these journals; and lays before its readers the ribaldry and mis-statements of a paper excommunicated from society, as if it were the truthful narrative of passing events on the other side of the Atlantic, a fair expression of public feeling and opinion, and an average specimen of American newspaper talent and newspaper morality."

The London Morning Past and its correspondents, having thus defended the absent and vindicated the press of the United States, we owe it to that press to explain why we should have been thus assuited by the additors of the Home Learnel and the

that press to explain why we should have been thus assailed by the editors of the Home Journal and the Day Book—N. P. Willis and Stimson—par nobile

The name of the Day Book never appeared in our columns but once, until this day; and then for the columns but once, until this day; and then for the simple purpose of enabling us to say, in the name of Mr. Webster, and some half dozen of our most prominent statesmen, and in the name and behalf of many of our leading merchants, that a card, got up and widely circulated, purporting to be an endorsement of the principles of the Day Book, and urging subscription to it, was a gross and deliberate forgery. The article copied by the Times, was in gray to an excession of its fraud, and, of rate forgery. The article copied by the Times, was in reply to an exposure of its fraud; and, of course, never was noticed by us. So utterly obscure is the print in which it appeared, that, although it has been published for some years in this city, we have never by any accident met with a dozen copies of it during the whole period of its existence.

Mr. N. P. Willis and the Home Journal, the actual author and originator of most of the Day Bock's slanders, are better known; and because Book's as landers, are better known; and because they are well known, we feel called upon to explain the origin of what is reputed to have been one of the fowlest and most cowardly assaults upon private character ever made by a newspaper in this country. That characteristic assault was, as our readors well know, made after we had left the country, and was forwarded by its author to our Consul in Vienna, for circulation in that city. But the Consul is a gentleman, and, of course, could not lower himself to so base a purpose, nor would be even permit us to read the attack, which he simply characterized as infamous and base. Since our return, it has been repeatedly enclosed to us, together with full particulars of Willia's connection with the Forrest divorce case, his being horsewhipped by Forrest, and a full account of his doings in Europe, his borrowing money from ladies in the absence of their tuebands, and all his Jeremy Diddler propensities while abrond. But we had promised never to read the attack, and to this day have not read any part of it; nor did we intend ever to have alluded to it or its author; and we shall now content ourself the attack, and to this day have not read any part of it; nor did we intend ever to have alluded to it or its author; and we shall now content ourself with simply showing why be has assailed us, in order that the editor of the London Moreing Post may know the character of our assailant. In this community we are both known, and, therefore, no defecte against assault from that quarter is necessary, nor would it be excusable.

Some twenty years ago, we read in the New York Mirror that N. P. Willis had gone abroad, and would be the foreign correspondent of that paper. The sequel is well known. Willis became an inmate of Lady Blessington's coterie—the most immoral in London, but which was composed of the highest intellects of the age. It is scarcely neces-

hierai in London, but which was emposed of highest intellects of the age. It is searcely not early to add that the female members of it were of doubtful respectability, and never admitted it the higher and better circles of English society white no gentleman lost social east by frequent Lady Blessington's brilliant circle. Through a medium, While obtained access to many of the b houses in England, where he was treated with a freedom, confidence, and hearitality which an Ehouses in England, where he was treated with the freedom, confidence, and hospitality which an Englishman so well knows how to extend to those who are once admitted into his house. That hospitality he repaid by selling to the New York Micror, for the benefit of its readers, their family secreta, and revealing their every-day confidential conversations in relation to individuals! These publications went back to England, and one or two duels were about to take place in consequence of this vile setrainl of hospitality. Willis was excluded from centlemen's homes and tables, and the press united gentlemen's homes and tables, and the press united in citing his conduct as a specimen of American breeding, and the necessity of excluding in future all Americans from English homes—the sanctity and privacy of which they would violate and expose

and privacy of which they would violate and expose for a price:

We protested against this condemnation of a whole nation in consequence of the conduct of a mere adventurer, who did not even claim to know what belonged to the proprieties of social intercourse—who was utterly ignorant of the rules of society on both sides of the Atlantic—and whose habits, instincts, and connections, were alike at war with the feelings and breeding of a gentleman. The American press, generally, with scarcely an exception, took the same ground, and vindicated, as was their duty, the character of our countrymen from the slur cast upon it by Willis. After his return to the United States, we spout a winter with him at the Actor House; but peremptorily refused to be introduced to him or to recognise him as a gentleman, in consequence of his proveroisally had cruduct everywhere throughout Europe. It happened, however, that in the summer 1841 or '42, at Sarstoga, Willis arrived at the United States about mid-dny, and came into the drawing-room, when we were the only gentlemen in the room. He was a mid-day, and came into the drawing-room, when we were the only gentlemen in the room. He was a stranger to all the ladies present; and, coming directly to us, we recognised him as an acquaintance.

and named him to the ladies without any special introduction, and left the room. Subsequently we spoke in the street in passing; and once, and once only, did we ever pause to exchange a solitary observation. He quarrelled with our assistant, Mr. Raymond; and, as it was our duty to do, we gave Mr. Raymond; and, as it was our duty to do, we gave Mr. Raymond the use of our columns to defend himself, simply requiring that he should do so over his own signature. This he did effectually; and by way of showing Willis's excuse for disliking us, we republish on our outside, Mr. Raymond's last letter to Willis, for which, as we afterwards learned, Willis threatened to horsewhip us, but finally thought better of it.

In 184-, a very dear friend of ours—one who was beloved by all who knew him, and who still mourn his untimely end, without dreaming that Willis caused his death—discovered that his only daughter, the idol of his soul, and upon whom all a father's love and means had been lavished, had fallen a victim to Willis's arts. Her ruin was complete; but her heart-broken father still clung to the hope of hiding from the world her shame. He made but one confidant of his daughter's fall, hesides ourself; and we proceeded to compel Willis to surrender certain letters in his possession, which admitted her fall, and which he shamefully preserved from the basest motives. He was accordingly requested to be at the office of the gentleman referred to, at a certain hour. We met him there. What followed need not be told, except that he was allowed twenty-four hours to make the surrender of the letters of his victim. At the expiration of that time we met him agair, received from him the letters, which even the most upprincipled libertine, possessing one particle of human feeling, would have destroyed as soon as read; and from that day to this, never suffered him to speak to us, even in the street. Our success in thus hiding from the world the shame of his dear child, gladdened the heart of our friend; but his was not the sature to

in language which even the editors of the Day Book could not excel, and contented themselves with borrowing.

The London Morning Post will judge from this brief narrative of our acquaintance with Willis, and the cause of his abuse of us, precisely the value of that abuse. We have never, by an accident, met him in the house of a gentleman in this city but once. He writes about society; but he writes from what he gathers in the lobbies of the Opera House and theatres, and at concerts, and, possibly, in families on the outskirts of society, who are led to believe that he has access to good houses, and knows something of what he writes. But this is an error. He is not admitted into society; and we know the fact, that ladies who occasionally imprudently tolerate him at the opera or theatre, have made such tolerance dependent upon the fact that he shall never join them in Broadway. Had Mrs. Forrest understood his actual position, it is probable that she would not now be suffering from his acquaintance; and had some kind friend teld Jenny Lind, on her arrival in this country, who Willis was and is, the people of the United States would not have had it proolaimed through the Home Jourmo! that he had paraded our streets in her company. The fact that he persuaded Miss Lind thus to set at defiance public opinion, and merely for the purpose of publishing it, will open the eyes of one so experienced as the editor of the London Morning Post, to the true character of the man, and render further comment by us out of place.

SCHEDULE B.

[From the New York Hernd of Saturday.]

Post, to the true character of the man, and render further comment by us out of place.

SCHEDULE B.

[From the New York Herald of Saturday.]

WILLIS VS. WEBB.

To the Public, (in Correction of a Statement made by Col. Webb.)

Some five or six years ago, when I was editing a daily paper in this city, I received several letters from a young school-girl, who is now a most respectable married lady, residing, with her husband and children, in a neighboring State. She was a child of a great deal of irregular genius and eccentricity of conduct; but, withal, never seemed to me to have either the idea or the consisiousness of any impropriety. She would go where she liked, call on any gentleman whom she cared to see, and once, it is well known, when offended at home, went and offered herself as a servant girl to a family in the city. Being very beautiful, she was very much admired; but I have often said of her, and say now, that I never knew so wild, brilliant and apparently lawless a creature, who inspired so universal a confidence in her virtue. Until Colonel Webb's caluminous publication of Thursday, to which this is a reply, I never head it doubted.

This young girl had a passion for literary fame, and, if I remember rightly, wrote a movel before the marriage. Her letters to me were the irregulating and impatient of silence; but, however disconnected and thapsodical, they seemed to me more full than wa at all common of the unconcentrated promise o genius. What sentiment in the n was addressed to see the irregulating the sentiment in the n was addressed to elebrity and appreciation. A editor's drawer is full of such propitatory compliments, and he is indeed silly if he consider thom as anything but the toll to the pathway of fame.

On her return from Europe, some time after. I

anything but the toll to the pathway of fame.

On her return from Europe, some time after. I heard that this lady was about to be married, and a goutleman wrote to me for an interview, and courterously applied for her letters. I had laid them aside, thinking them interesting, as the first irregular utterance of what I thought would prove to be gamins, but promptly returned them, with no idea that there was suything either threatening or unusual in the request. Col. Webb was present when they were delivered, but expressed no dissatisfaction with me or with them. I, soon after, met her father, who, I understood, had supposed me to be father, who, I understood, had supposed me to be father, who, it will be construities of his daughter, and had felt unkindly to me; but with a few words of explanation, we shook hands and parted, and of that matter I never thought more.

of explaination, we shook hands and parted, and of that matter I rever thought more.

Of the "complete ruin" of this lady, (now living most respectably with her husband and onliden in a neighboring State.) Col Wobb necuses me, in larguage to gross to copy. He begins by spring that he was, himself, a very dear friend of her farher. She has been married six years—this is the first time she has ever been accused of guilt, privately or publicly, to my knowledge—and Col. Webb now accuses me of her ruin, calling her father a "very dear friend," whose "untimety end he mourns "This accusation is unqualifiedly natrue; but even if so truel and wiiful a falschood were true, what human heart would be thought capable of so agonizing the living daughter of a dead friend, as to re-parade it to the world after it was forgotten? It was because he revergefully thought that a frest alander of this kind would be the "drop too nuch" in my cup of such trouble et this time; and—(if the public mind prefer to take sides against innocence, with

its mind prefer to take sides against innocence, with out proof or reason) - perhaps it will!

N. P. Wild, is.

REJOINDER OF COL. WELL.

(From the Courier and Enquirer, May 19.)

Any reply to the foregoing [Willis' case,] if more explicit than our statements, might possibly lead to at exposure of the party to whom we allude—a result to which, of course, we cannot be a party. When we determined briefly, yet clearly, to apprise the London Morwing Post, and the public, of the cause of Will's country towards us—which, it must be remembered, was evinced in an article beating his own signature, and published in the Hime Journal, after we had left the country, without the excess even of a previous dimensity—it was not until mai, after we had left its country, without the excess even of a previous disaculty—it was not until we had arrived at the conclusion that we could do so without the slightest risk of the public being able to conjecture who was the party implicated. We were prepared, of course, for surmises and rations of the most ridiculous character; but we had being a left to the most ridiculous character; but we had you remarked to the whom we slidded; and we had ever understand to whom we slidded; and we have removed. If there we those who, from their past is militarity with Willis, are liable to suspicious and in the feet all the removed the manes of half a dozen of his fetuals riends are banded about about a height the particular votum referred to by us, we are not responsible for their names being thus used.

Whether Willis, in the foregoing card, intended simply to mislead the public in regard to the party implicated, by pretending to misunderstand us, effectually to serven the injured, is more than we can determine. In charity we are willing to consider this as one of his motives for devising and publishing a romance, which, if "founded on fact," is one to which we have never been a next and this as one of his motives for devising and publishing a romance, which, if "founded on fact," is one to which we have never been a party, and with the details of which we are utterly ignorant. We unhesitatingly declare that we know nothing of such a case as Will's describes; and if it be other than fection, we advise him in future to abstain from revealing any of his affairs with "young girls" who have happened to exhibit "unconcentrated promise of genius," but who have settled down into "respectable married ladies." They will not thank him for being pointed at in connection with our charge; and in this relation, his card is an offence against every gentlemanly impulse. Even if his publication were true, and had a bearing upon what we allege, it would be unpardonable in him to make it, to screen himself from public indignation. And if his life has been such that the public have scores of names upon whom to fix suspicion, it is no affair of

hattee upon whom to fix suspicion, it is no affair of ours. We repeat, that but one person lives, besides Willis and ourself, who can possibly know to whom we have alluded; and most assuredly, we shall do nothing to point suspicion to its victim. We now reiterate every word of our charge; and were we writing for the readers of the Courter and Empurer only, we should be content to leave the matter upon the issue of our respective character; for trath. But this may not be, under existing cir-